



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/521,841 | 07/27/2005 | Robert Wieder | 601-1-134PCTUS | 1291 |
| 23565 7590 05/15/2008 | | | | |
| KLAUBER & JACKSON | | | | |
| 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE | | | | |
| HACKENSACK, NJ 07601 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| NATARAJAN, MEERA | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1643 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/15/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/521,841

Applicant(s)

WIEDER, ROBERT

Examiner

MEERA NATARAJAN

Art Unit

1643

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Meera Natarajan.(3) Sarah Fashena.(2) Larry Helms.(4) Robert Wieder.

Date of Interview: 08 May 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nista et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Nista et al. was discussed in regards to the type of cells used in the reference. Claim 1 was discussed and amending the claim to recite "said method comprising administering to a mammal" to overcome the art rejection was suggested. This amendment to the claim would overcome the 102 rejection, however a new search would have to be performed to determine if there was additional prior art or whether a 103 obviousness rejection would apply.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Meera Natarajan/

/Larry R. Helms/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required